



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/626,600	04/02/1996	MICHAEL F. QUINN	107040.007	8034

27510 7590 06/30/2003

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
607 14TH STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 900  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/626,600

Applicant(s)

QUINN ET AL.

Examiner

Siegfried E. Chencinski

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 33-37, 39-41 and 43 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cukor and Reding.

3. **Claim 38 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cukor and Reding as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Dysart.

4. **Claim 42 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cukor and Reding as applied to claims 35 and 36 above, and further in view of Wang.

Features recited in the instant claims were addressed in the prior Office actions, BAPI and the Examiner's Answer. Applicant is referred to these prior actions.

Applicant has argued in his previous filing that the Board and the Examiner fail to consider arguments that distinguished the present invention over the cited prior art because it was determined that these points of distinction were not specifically recited in the claims. Applicant has cited page 12, first full paragraph of the BPAI Decision.

Applicants then amended the claims to recite the capacity of local memories and the process of determining if a requested document is stored locally before requesting the data from a central site.

In response, applicant's arguments that Cukor does not provide sufficient memory for storing documents or for long term storing is not persuasive. Cukor clearly teaches a storage for storing documents. There are no such assertions in Cukor itself of the size of their memory capacity. Absent a teaching is not an indication that a feature is non-obvious. Applicant is reminded that:

Art Unit: 3628

*In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969) "Reference disclosure must be evaluated for all that it fairly suggests and not only for what is indicated as preferred." *In re Jacoby*, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962) "Problem cannot be approached on basis that workers in the art would know only what they could read in references; those skilled in radiator art must be presumed to know something about radiators apart from what references disclose" "it is immaterial that reference does not disclose specific function set forth in applicant's specification, since this is merely an additional attribute possessed by reference structure which would be obvious to one skilled in the art in a use which one skilled in the art, following teachings of prior art, might make of it"

**A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including non-preferred embodiments.**

Furthermore, Cukor et al at the time of filing, available memory capacity was limited. Cukor does not specify the size of scanned documents or the storage capacities of files or documents. Thus, Cukor would have taken great care in avoiding erasure of important financial documents in their local memories. See column 6, lines 43-48. Applicant's statement that "[A]t the beginning of the next day, those documents stored on the 80 megabytes of memory will presumably be overwritten by that day's documents" is not stated in Cukor. This unsupported statement made by applicant is not convincing because Cukor ensures that sufficient memory is available for a particular day's transaction. Moreover, Cukor states that "the remote stations include means 26 for communicating document images and related information back and forth with the central processing site". (Column 7, second full paragraph). Thus, overwritten a day's transactions would not have occurred in the system of Cukor.

As per applicant's argument that Cukor's system does not check to determine if the requested document is stored locally before requesting the data from the central processing site because a temporary file is erased the next day is not convincing because it is not required that the memory is completely full for all transactions occurring for a given day. Transactions are transmitted to a particular location where all transaction processing can be taken place.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed March 31, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant has essentially repeated the arguments of his most recent Response to Office Action and has only presented arguments against the rejection of claims 33-35. As such, applicant has implicitly accepted the rejections of claims 36-43. Applicant also recites certain features contained in the application's specifications. The arguments can be summed as follows:

- 1) Unique features included in the specifications;
- 2) A storage escalation scheme and use of multiple image formats.
- 3) Checking local storage for an image before checking central storage.
- 4) The Cukor reference's local memory is severely limited, thus not matching the claimed minimum memory capabilities (of 500 meg).

B. Please note the Examiner's responses to Applicant's arguments:

1) **UNIQUE FEATURES (Page 2, lines 4-11):** This argument is moot since it only cites features contained in the specifications and makes no reference at all to contents of the claims.

2) **STORAGE ESCALATION SCHEME AND USE OF MULTIPLE IMAGE FORMATS (Page 3, lines 1-21):** The Examiner does not find an explicitly stated storage escalation scheme and the use of multiple image formats in the claims. However, only claims are at issue. Applicant's argument promoting these two features is moot because the argument relies solely on the recitation of specifications elements (page 3, lines 1-21).

3) **CHECKING LOCAL STORAGE FOR AN IMAGE BEFORE CHECKING CENTRAL STORAGE (Page 3, lines 21- 23):** The Examiner's response to this argument is repeated above.

4) **INSUFFICIENT LOCAL MEMORY IN THE RELIED UPON PRIOR ART (Page 3, line 24):** The Examiner's response to this argument is repeated above.

***Conclusion***

**6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Siegfried Chencinski whose telephone number is 703-305-6199. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9am to 6pm. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough, can be reached on 703- 308-0505.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

*Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington D.C. 20231*

or faxed to:

7687 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

-8177 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2411 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.


SEC

Application/Control Number: 08/626,600

Page 6

Art Unit: 3628

June 23, 2003

  
HYUNG SOUH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600